



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of Hebrew in 1871, Renan tranquilly pursued his studies and his meditations with little regard to any influence he might have on public opinion, while Arnold became more and more a propagandist, attempting "to make reason and the will of God prevail." He might be regarded as the partisan of non-partisanship, the prophet of the dogma of the undogmatic. Righteousness he defined as "harmony with the universal order" but some actions that his friend Renan found, theoretically at least, in harmony with the universal order were not of the sort that he himself classed under the head of righteousness.<sup>20</sup> The inherited ardor of the controversialist grew stronger in the son of Thomas Arnold, while the aging French professor kept asking himself, "What is the use of so much agitation merely to change an old error for a new one." So Arnold became the apostle of culture and Renan mused and dreamed, and worked on his Semitic inscriptions and finished his *Histoire du peuple d'Israël* and his volume on the fourteenth century French rabbis, heedless of any effects they might have on the beliefs or practices of the world.

LEWIS F. MOTT.

*College of the City of New York.*

---

### THE 'MARCELLUS' THEORY OF THE FIRST QUARTO *HAMLET*

Mr. Henry David Gray has made a dash at the question of the First Quarto of *Hamlet*, with brilliant results; he sets forth a discovery that offers a very simple solution of the problem. This discovery is best given in his own words. "But the First Quarto *Hamlet* furnishes us with a clue which I believe has been hitherto overlooked. A careful comparison of it with the true Shakesperean text will reveal the fact that the pirated quarto was based upon a very corrupt version of the acted play supplied to the publisher by the player who acted the part of Marcellus. With this mere suggestion, I might safely leave the proof to anyone's comparison of the texts and his inevitable deductions from it; but this is my

<sup>20</sup> *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 44: *Discourses in America*, pp. 41 and 55: *Essays in Criticism*, Third Series, p. 168.

'hinseck,' and like the father of Joseph Vance, I insist upon the right to 'crock' it myself."<sup>1</sup> The slight caution expressed in the "I believe" of the first sentence of this extract soon disappears and the tone of assurance grows as the article proceeds. We have this actor set before us in form and feature as he lived; in addition, we come to know a 'hack poet,' who furnished the text where 'Marcellus's' memory failed. To quote again, from the end (p. 179): "But I have had my fair share of deductions from this simple bit of observation. The result of it is simply that it is fairly demonstrable that the Quarto of 1603 was provided from the acting version of *Hamlet* and contains no additional traces of an earlier play."

Before taking up Mr. Gray's proofs it may be well to consider in how far this is *his* 'hinseck.' Mr. W. H. Widgery, in his Harness Prize Essay of 1880<sup>2</sup> had noticed many of the things that attracted Mr. Gray's attention in 1915. He has not, however, indulged in such wealth of deduction, nor has his reconstructive imagination that sureness of touch that characterizes Mr. Gray. A few quotations will be of service, not only to set forth the nature of his observations, but also, perhaps, to supplement Mr. Gray. "The speech of Voltemar in Act II, Sc. ii, is suspiciously correct: he may also have taken the part of the player king, and in him I believe we have the thief who made a copy by stealth of Shakespeare's early play in the general bustle and confusion that took place at James' accession, when my Lord Chamberlain's men became the King's players."<sup>3</sup> "The 'true and perfect Coppie' then being carefully guarded, I believe that Ling got the player who took the part of Voltemar to get a hurried transcript of Shakespeare's older play: that he sent pirates into the theatre<sup>4</sup> to take shorthand notes of the first two acts in order to give this stolen transcript a more colorable likeness to the play running,<sup>5</sup> so that

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Language Review*, x, 174.

<sup>2</sup> *The First Quarto Edition of Hamlet, 1603, Two Essays to which the Harness Prize was Awarded, 1880.* By C. H. Herford and W. H. Widgery.

<sup>3</sup> Widgery, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Gray, p. 179. "He [the hack poet] may very possibly have been materially aided in his task by attending a performance of the play."

<sup>5</sup> Compare Gray, p. 177. "'Marcellus' as we have seen, was a man of considerable ignorance; but his early entrance in the drama enabled him to furnish copy, which at the start would be fairly acceptable, and this may have made the pirate publisher particularly prone to deal with him."

anybody who picked up the book on the stalls and began to read it might imagine he had Shakespeare's drama."<sup>6</sup> "The scene between Hamlet, Horatio, and Marcellus displays the fewest discrepancies between the Quartos."<sup>7</sup>

We can now consider Mr. Gray's proof. "Marcellus is the only character in the play whose lines are given with approximate accuracy throughout, and the scenes in which he appears are by far the closest to the authentic text. . . . The oft-noted fact that the first act is so much fuller and better than the rest is at once accounted for; as is the increased demand made in the later acts upon the hack poet, of whom I shall have more to say presently. 'Marcellus,' as I may call the actor for convenience, had certain discoverable characteristics which are worth our notice; it is in accord with his other qualities that he should have told the would-be publisher that he could quote or write out the play from start to finish; and every characteristic of Q<sub>1</sub> is explainable by his wretched attempt to do so, supplemented by the hack poet, whose services were soon found to be essential."<sup>8</sup> "Inasmuch as the scenes in which the Players appear are those which contain most of the verbatim reporting, there is good reason for supposing that 'Marcellus' may also have sustained the part of one of the Players."<sup>9</sup>

It will be seen from these quotations that the theories of Widgery and of Gray are substantially the same. Widgery takes the actor who played Voltemar for the thief and suggests that he may also have taken the part of the player king; he notes that the scene between Hamlet, Horatio, and Marcellus shows the fewest discrepancies between the Quartos. Gray fails to note that Voltemar's part is the most accurate in Q<sub>1</sub>; it does not, therefore, occur to him that here is the actor-thief. He agrees with Widgery that the thief ('Marcellus' or 'Voltemar') may have taken a part in the scenes of the Players.<sup>10</sup>

Mr. Gray's deductions are based mainly upon his statement that the speeches of Marcellus are more correctly given than those of any other part. Although this is not strictly true, as noted

<sup>6</sup> Widgery, pp. 139-140.

<sup>8</sup> Gray, pp. 174-5.

<sup>7</sup> Widgery, p. 152.

<sup>9</sup> Gray, p. 178.

<sup>10</sup> These two views may be easily brought into accord by the hypothesis that one actor took the parts of Marcellus, Voltemar, and one of the Players (Widgery, the Player King).

above concerning Voltmar's part, if it were true, its significance would depend, to a large extent, upon the nature of Marcellus's part. Marcellus appears in three scenes, I. i, I. ii, and I. iv-v (taking scenes iv and v as one). In I. ii he has by himself three speeches, consisting in all of fourteen words, in unison with Horatio four speeches with a total of nineteen words. In I. iv-v he has but little more to say, his longest speech here consisting of three lines; four short speeches have a total of twenty words, and three in unison with Horatio consist of fourteen words. In two places in this scene he transposes and condenses the dialogue considerably (I, iv, 80-81, 88-91, Globe edition), and one of his speeches (one line) he omits completely (I, v, 147. Gray notes these changes, p. 177, note). From all this it is apparent that any impression of the accuracy of his part must come from Act I, Scene i. Here he has a part of some importance, forty-three lines in all (counting each speech less than a line as one line). Eight of his speeches are one line or less in length and seven are over one line. Of the seven (with a total of 35 lines), three consist of two lines each, one consists of four lines, and three consist of seven, eight, and ten lines respectively. The speeches of considerable length, then, are three, with a total of twenty-five lines. Voltmar's speech (II, ii, 60-71) of twenty-one lines is as accurately given,<sup>11</sup> yet it did not attract Mr. Gray's attention, probably because it occurs in a scene in which there are very great differences between the quartos.

I have shown that any impression of 'Marcellus's' accuracy in his own part must come from the first scene of the play, and from about twenty-five lines of that scene. The point that I wish to make is, that this is of no particular significance; it certainly is too small and too insecure a basis upon which to build such a structure as Mr. Gray has framed.

We may now turn from 'Marcellus,' the actor-thief, to his partner in piracy, the 'hack poet.' Mr. Gray has much to say about him in a general way but cites explicitly only two passages (one of these by the way) that show his work. The first of these

<sup>11</sup> Gray (p. 176, note) gives a list of the mistakes of Marcellus in his own part. The following are the readings of  $Q_1$  different from  $Q_2$  or F, in the part of Voltmar (line-numbers are those of the Globe edition): 'returmes' for 'returme,' 60; 'forth' for 'out,' 61; 'would' for 'might,' 77; 'that' for 'this,' 78; 'allowances' for 'allowance,' 79.

is the First Quarto version of the soliloquy<sup>12</sup> "To be or not to be," the second, the scene between Horatio and the Queen,<sup>13</sup> which is not found in the Second Quarto. A full discussion of the form of the soliloquy in *Q*<sub>1</sub> is not in place here, but it is surely unjust to hold even a hack poet responsible for it; it is plain that a very careless typesetter is responsible for much of the confusion and obscurity here. This is one of the most corrupt passages of *Q*<sub>1</sub>, and unfortunately it is generally quoted or cited as an illustration of the general state of the text of *Q*<sub>1</sub>.

Concerning the scene between Horatio and the Queen, Mr. Gray says (p. 179): "The short scene between Horatio and the Queen—which never took place—only illustrates how far he finally came from giving the dialogue of the acted drama. All that is contained in this scene, which is wholly in the style of the hack poet, is brought out elsewhere in the play—except that here, as in the Closet Scene, the Queen's character and attitude are reformed. Her scene with Horatio was merely a ready expedient for dramatizing 'Marcellus's' notes and fragments." This is surely a simple explanation of the origin of this scene, but it leaves several things unaccounted for. The scene contains in brief form what is given in *Q*<sub>2</sub>, Act IV, Scene vi (Hamlet's letter to Horatio) and Act V, Scene ii, 1-62 (Hamlet's conversation with Horatio). The position of the scene in *Q*<sub>1</sub> is the same as that of IV. vi, in *Q*<sub>2</sub> and it is rational to suppose (whatever its origin) that it takes the place of that scene. Mr. Gray's explanation of its origin is that 'Marcellus' gave the hack poet "notes and fragments" chiefly from two passages of *Q*<sub>2</sub> noted above, and on the basis of these the hack poet constructed the scene. One characteristic of the scene is noted, "here, as in the Closet Scene, the Queen's character and attitude are reformed," but no explanation of the fact is offered; one is left to infer that the reformation in both scenes is the work of the hack poet. Now this difference between the character of the Queen in *Q*<sub>1</sub> and in *Q*<sub>2</sub> has long been noticed and has been explained in many ways, which need not be considered here. What is of importance is the fact that in this respect *Q*<sub>1</sub> stands nearer to Belleforest than does *Q*<sub>2</sub>. Is it not strange (if we accept Mr. Gray's explanation) that the hack poet reformed the Queen

<sup>12</sup> Lines 815-836, Furness' reprint, *Variorum Hamlet*, Vol. II.

<sup>13</sup> Lines 1747-1782.

away from  $Q_2$  in the direction of Belleforest? Of course it may be said that it is mere accident, but that explanation will hardly appeal to reason. Anyhow, why was the hack poet interested in the reformation of the Queen?

Furthermore, one of the lines<sup>14</sup> of this scene between Horatio and the Queen has by several authorities been connected with an expression<sup>15</sup> in *Der Bestrafte Brudermord*.<sup>16</sup> Now, whatever explanation of the origin of the German play we may accept, it is worth noting that the hack poet here also managed to get into his scene a line that some consider to be a fragment of an earlier version of the play.<sup>17</sup> In two places, then, the hack poet has incorporated in this scene matter that appears to be of more ancient origin than either  $Q_1$  or  $Q_2$ . All this bears upon the second part of Mr. Gray's conclusion "that the Quarto of 1603 . . . contains no additional traces of an earlier play."

It is probably impossible to prove that 'Marcellus' did not steal the play; I cannot see that Mr. Gray has proved that he did commit the theft. The hack poet is a very simple handy invention to account for the fact that parts of  $Q_1$ , particularly in Acts IV and V, are much inferior to other parts;<sup>18</sup> for his existence not a bit of proof has been adduced.

I have not here attempted a formal refutation of the 'Marcellus' theory, as Mr. Gray calls it; my object is rather to point out a few obstacles in the way of its ready acceptance, and to call attention to Widgery's work, which seems in some danger of oblivion.

In reading discussions of the First Quarto and its relation to the Second Quarto, *Der Bestrafte Brudermord*, and the *Ur-Hamlet* I have become impressed by the fact that the First Quarto has never had a fair chance to speak for itself. It has perpetually to suffer comparison with "the true and perfect Coppie"; its worst corruption is quoted as a fair sample of its general character; it is branded as the stolen goods of pirate actors, shorthand reporters,

<sup>14</sup> Line 1751, "Being crossed by the contention of the windes."

<sup>15</sup> "Nun begab es sich, dass wir eines Tages contrairen Wind hatten."

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Widgery, p. 119, "but the Fratricide and  $Q_1$  agree in Hamlet's 'Being crossed by the contention of the windes.'"

<sup>17</sup> For a full discussion of the point, see Evans, "*Der Bestrafte Brudermord* and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," *Modern Philology*, II, 440.

<sup>18</sup> "Revision" is also called in to explain a few things, p. 178.

and printers. Now and then editors give it credit for better readings than the Second Quarto or the First Folio, and some have recognized the force of its more direct movement where the Second Quarto dawdles along through the last two acts; but it has never, I believe, been given full and fair consideration so far as the independent restoration of its text is concerned. This text in many places appears to be hopelessly corrupt; lines are omitted, transposed, entangled; words are misplaced, mistaken, distorted, mutilated beyond recognition. In spite of all this, I believe that the case against the First Quarto is not so bad as it is generally made out. However that may be, it is plain that the first step towards its restoration is an independent edition of the play (the First Quarto *Hamlet*) after the manner of treatment given to other important Elizabethan dramas. Such an edition I hope to undertake in the near future.

F. G. HUBBARD.

*The University of Wisconsin.*

---

## MME DE MONTESPAN AND *LA PRINCESSE DE CLÈVES*<sup>1</sup>

One indication of the interest aroused at Paris by the publication of the *Princesse de Clèves* in 1678 is the constant demand addressed to Bussy for his opinion of the new novel. In a letter to Mme de Sévigné, dated June 26 or 27, 1678, he gives his approbation to the first volume and then delivers himself as follows:

“ Dans le second, l’aveu de Madame de Clèves à son mari est extravagant et ne se peut dire que dans une histoire véritable: mais quand on en fait une à plaisir, il est ridicule de donner à son héroïne un sentiment si extraordinaire. L’auteur, en le faisant, a plus songé à ne pas ressembler aux autres romans qu’à suivre le bon sens. Une femme dit rarement à son mari qu’on est amoureux d’elle, mais jamais qu’elle ait de l’amour pour un autre que pour lui: <sup>2</sup> et d’autant moins qu’en se jetant à ses genoux, comme fait la

<sup>1</sup> It is a pleasure to thank Professors G. N. Henning, S. Alden, G. Schoepferle, and the Boston Public Library, who have kindly sent me essential documents, and Professors L. M. Casís, H. E. Woodbridge, and C. H. Grandgent, who have criticised my manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> Mme de Clèves does not put it quite so crudely, but her delicacy is lost on Bussy.